

widely employed for this type of poetry. Here she gives one of the most helpful discussions of the book—the poetic use of metaphor. Scholars, she rightly observes, are often too literal, because they are unable to take the right perspective. Metaphors from another culture strike them as “grotesque,” “peculiar,” or “exotic.” In her translation Falk handles metaphors with particular skill, so that the spirit of the original is preserved and the beauty of the resulting English poetry enhanced. In 7:4 she leaves out the place names (poetic enough in Biblical Hebrew, but stumbling-blocks in English).

Your eyes—two silent pools,

Your face—a tower that overlooks the hills.

Chapter Five discusses specific contexts, themes, and motifs. Especially helpful is her treatment of the botanical terms. Finally, twenty-seven pages of notes given explanations of why she translated each “poem” as she did.

Good translations require scholarly knowledge of the Bible, literary sensitivity, skill in the use of the target language, and a grasp of linguistic principles. Falk has the first three in good measures, and for the fourth her natural skills compensate for her lack of theory.

KEITH CRIM

Hodges, Zane C. and Arthur L. Farstad (eds): **The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text**. Nashville and Camden, N.Y.: Thomas Nelson 1982. xlv + 810. £8.40.

Even though one may suspect that the motive of the editors of the *Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text* (= GNTMT) is to re-establish the King James Version in the manner of Dean Burgon, it is nevertheless refreshing to read a Greek testament that differs so much from other printed editions of the past one hundred years. This text is not the *Textus Receptus*, as the apparatus to GNTMT makes clear; TR differs from GNTMT about three to four times a page on average for most of the New Testament although more frequent variation is seen in Revelation. GNTMT is a critical edition of the majority text; “majority” in the title means the bulk of Byzantine mss., most of which are cursives written between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries. “Majority” thus approximates to the manuscripts designated \mathfrak{K} in the old Nestle texts or to the category V mss. in K. Aland and B. Aland, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments* pp. 167–170.

Those who are interested in the reasons behind this enterprise may find the book by Hodges’ pupil W. N. Pickering *The Identity of the New Testament Text* instructive; this monograph however *must* be read in conjunction with the critique by G. D. Fee in *The Bible Translator* 31 (1980), 107–118 or with his fuller review in the *Westminster Theological Journal* XLI pp. 397–423.

This text provides a useful antidote for those who have allowed themselves to be persuaded that Nestle-Aland²⁶ (N-A²⁶) = United Bible Societies Greek New Testament³ (UBS³) represents the best text available. Readings in the Byzantine text need to be taken seriously, as G. D. Kilpatrick pointed out in the MacGregor memorial volume in 1965. In many cases the majority text may be original. For instance, an attachment to the majority text by GNTMT results in a good text at Mark 1.16, 27; 6.22; 9.38; 11.24; Luke 24.53; Acts 22.9. The readings printed here may well represent the original text—but they do so

because they conform to the author's language, style, usage or theology or because palaeographical reasons can be found for the variation. Such principles are acknowledged even if they are not necessarily given their deserved prominence on p. xxxviii f. The above readings are not original just because they are well supported by many mss.; one can compile an equally long list of readings found in the majority text that are indefensible. Such readings are printed at Mark 1.2, 4; 1 Timothy 3.16. The editors take a simplistic view: their choice is presented as one between "majority" and "Egyptian": the allegedly idiosyncratic "Western" mss. are virtually ignored. Readings should however not be printed on the basis of numerical support any more than they should be printed blindly on the evidence of early Egyptian papyri. Each variant in the textual tradition ought to be weighed on its own merits.

In most of the book the text is followed by two sets of apparatus. In the first are set out "significant" variants among the surviving mss. together with changes from the 1825 Oxford TR. The second apparatus is said to include all variants (not found in the first) where GNTMT differs from N-A²⁶/UBS³ (and even those very few places where N-A²⁶ differs from UBS³, for instance at Luke 20.9; John 20.18). Only four individual uncials (Ⲡ ABC) and eight papyri are regularly cited in the apparatus. When they support a variant in either apparatus DWL⊕fam. 1, fam. 13 occasionally are also to be found. Sometimes other mss occur (p. xxi) such as R (printed, with L, in the wrong typeface) at Luke 2.26: there the testimony of Ⲡ^c is ignored. Spot checks however show that the apparatus is generally reliable. Uncial B is not extant for Revelation and the reference to this manuscript on p. xxxii will mislead the unwary. Lectionaries, versions and fathers are omitted as the aim of the edition is to present the majority text in continuous Greek mss.

In general the consensus of Egyptian mss. appears under the siglum Ⲅ and the vast bulk of Byzantine mss. under the Gothic letter Ɱ. When a reduced number of mss. is in support M is used. When the majority text is "significantly" divided M^{pl} is printed—and the details about how the mss. divide must be gleaned mainly from von Soden, whose edition has provided most of the information used by the editors. A key to von Soden's mss. is not provided nor is the reader specifically directed to the available published conversion tables. This is a serious omission especially as a cross-reference system *is* printed (p. xlv f.) for Hoskier's classification of mss. of Revelation. In this list Hoskier's 106 is said to represent two different Gregory numbers (Gregory 1094 should = Hoskier 182). Where it is deemed necessary to specify in the apparatus defections within the majority text, the symbols used are, with minor modifications, taken from von Soden, which the editors claim to have checked. The editors do however express the hope (p. xxiii) that a new detailed apparatus to the NT can be prepared which will ultimately make it unnecessary to use von Soden. They may therefore be pleased to learn that the project to establish a full apparatus to Luke has now reached the first stage of printing by the Oxford University Press; this means that such a detailed apparatus will soon be available, at least for this gospel.

The GNTMT restores to the text of the NT the following verses; Matthew 12.47, 16.2b-3, 17.21, 18.11, 21.44, 23.14; Mark 7.16, 9.44, 46, 11.26, 15.28,

16.9-20; Luke 9.55b-56a, 22.19b-20, 43-44, 23.17, 24.12; John 5.3b-4; Acts 28.29; Romans 16.24. Elsewhere also the longer text (unless it is represented by D) is, in general, printed.

The pericope of the adulteress, taken as Johannine, and Revelation are treated to extensive discussions in the introduction, because the editors claim to have established family trees for the mss. containing this material and that Schmidt's K group in Revelation, and von Soden's μ^6 for the *pericope de Adultera* are close to the autographs. It is the editors' deluded hope that the history of the text for the rest of the NT can be similarly reconstructed. Such stemmatic reconstructions are dubious. Before decisions on groups can be made all variants need to be resolved objectively first: acceptance of a group deemed to be close to the original should not be the reason for preempting discussions of *v. ll.* deviating from that group. The editors have not demonstrated clearly enough why they favour K in Revelation or μ^6 in John 7.53-8.11. Too often it seems as if the decision on *v. ll.* has been prejudiced by which group supports the variants.

Despite some dogmatic statements in the introduction, the authors are modest enough to acknowledge that their use of M^{P^t} is tentative, that von Soden's influence needs careful monitoring, and that their genealogical stemmata are only provisional.

The Greek typeface is beautifully clear. Paragraphs are separated by English subheadings and, where appropriate, cross-references. A select bibliography is appended. Typographical errors are few.

J. K. ELLIOTT

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland: **Der Text des Neuen Testaments.** Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1982. 342 pp.

The sub-title of this book defines its scope as that of an "Introduction to scholarly editions, and to the theory and practice of modern textual criticism". Not only the specialist in textual criticism, but also any scholar with a general interest in the NT, can find useful information in this book about: (1) the editions of the Greek NT from Erasmus to the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland (pp. 13-56); (2) the tradition of the Greek NT (pp. 57-81); (3) the Greek manuscripts (pp. 82-190); (4) the ancient versions (pp. 191-226); (5) the use of modern critical editions, especially the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland and the third edition of the UBS Greek text (pp. 227-270); (6) other helps such as gospel synopses, lexica, grammars of NT Greek etc. (pp. 271-281); and finally (7) the practice of textual criticism (pp. 282-318). The 71 tables, including those of manuscripts, previous printed editions, and statistics, interspersed throughout the book, give the reader an immediate view of the material, but sometimes disturb continuous reading of the main text, especially when the tables follow one after the other.

Other useful aids for the student of NT textual history are the descriptions of the 88 papyri (pp. 106-111), the 274 uncials (now identified as 241 by the Münster Institute for NT Textual Research) (pp. 117-137), and about 150 of the 2795 minuscule manuscripts (pp. 140-164). It should however be pointed out that the chapter which refers to the Byzantine lectionaries is somewhat inadequate. Perhaps this is due to the writers' opinion concerning the value of the Byzantine text; but even so a description and evaluation of the lectionaries